



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/749,028	12/30/2003	David V. Pedersen	P46C1-US	8287
50905	7590	05/10/2005		
N. KENNETH BURRASTON KIRTON & MCCONKIE P.O. BOX 45120 SALT LAKE CITY, UT 84145-0120			EXAMINER ABRAMS, NEIL	
			ART UNIT 2839	PAPER NUMBER

DATE MAILED: 05/10/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/749,028	PEDERSEN ET AL.
	Examiner Neil Abrams	Art Unit 2839

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).

Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 3-10-2005

2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 2, 23, 37, 38 is/are pending in the application.
4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
6) Claim(s) 2, 7-23, 37, 38 is/are rejected.
7) Claim(s) 3-6, 13 is/are objected to.
8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) All b) Some * c) None of:
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. ____ .

5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6) Other: ____ .

Spec. objected to claim 3, term "unsignulated" is not seen. ~~For~~ claim 13 objected to, "means for securing" has no antecedent basis.

Fig. 9 part 908 appears to depict the claim 3 unsignulated wafer. If so the term should be used in spec in fig. 9 discussion.

Disclosure objected to, figs. 8, 9 relationship is disclosed in unclear and confusing manner ~~unclear and confusing manner~~ due in part to use of different numerals in figs. 8, 9 and lack of clear description in spec. Figs. 8A, AB do not provide clear disclosure for claims 9, 10 19 items in combination with parent claim limitations. Should thermal means be shown in fig. 9?

The drawings are objected to under 37 CFR 1.83(a). The drawings must show every feature of the invention specified in the claims. Therefore, the claims 9, 10, 19, temperature control means and thermal chucks in combination with parent claim features must be shown or the feature(s) canceled from the claim(s). No new matter should be entered.

Corrected drawing sheets in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. Any amended replacement drawing sheet should include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is being amended. The figure or figure number of an amended drawing should not be labeled as "amended." If a drawing figure is to be canceled, the appropriate figure must be removed from the replacement sheet, and where necessary, the remaining figures must be renumbered and appropriate changes made to the brief description of the several views of the drawings for

consistency. Additional replacement sheets may be necessary to show the renumbering of the remaining figures. Each drawing sheet submitted after the filing date of an application must be labeled in the top margin as either "Replacement Sheet" or "New Sheet" pursuant to 37 CFR 1.121(d). If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Figs. 8, 8B do not adequately depict these matters at issue.

Claims 9, 10, 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention. These claims are based on non-enabling disclosure for reasons discussed above.

Claims 17, 18, 20, 21 and 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Akram.

Akram system figs. 8, 3A, includes a support substrate 32 with terminals 34 and associated traces with bumps 34 also serving as means for connection to test means 54, socket substrate 36 with sockets 38, traces 56 on the socket substrate and means 62 for connecting traces to terminals and means 40 for pressing semiconductor contacts to the socket substrate. References in claim 17 to "elongate spring connection elements" are to intended use and do not structurally overcome the patent which shows pressing means. For claims 23, plural socket substrates shown in fig. 2A.

Claims 20, 21 define structure shown by Akrams. For claim 18 specifies of testing do not define structural features to avoid Akrams.

Claims 18, 22, 23 38 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Akram.

Claims 22, 38 relate to obvious choice of material and dimensions. Claims 18, 23 included in case issues arise, since Akram is not entirely clear with regard to these issues.

Claim 19 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Akram in view of ^{Pommer} ~~Shaffer~~.

Akram~~s~~ does not include thermal means. Pommer discloses such type means at 51, 52. Obvious to use such feature in Akram to protect the semiconductor.

Claims 2, 7, 8, 11, 12, 14, 15 37, 17, 18, 20-23 and 38 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Akram in view of Reymond, Jones and Farnworth.

For claim 2, Akram discussed above. Akram does not disclose semiconductors with elongate spring contacts. Jones, fig. 3 and Farnworth fig. 4 discloses such spring contacts on semiconductors. Obvious to use these type components (DUTS) in Akram. This would enable it s use with greater variety of components. Note Jones, figs, 2, 3 which show equivalence of semiconductor types. For claim 7, such dies shown by Farnworth. Claim 8 relates to standard use of test device. Claims 11, 12 features do not appear to be at issue. Claim 14, 15 met by Akram wires 62 and socket substrate pits 38. Claims 16, 37 relate to obvious choice of material and dimensions.

Claim 17, 18, etc included in case issues arise as to rejections set forth above.

Reymond is applied only to show at fig. 3a, how a semiconductor with spring contacts could be attached to a pcb, hence to clarify material, not explicit in Farnworth.

Claims 9, 10, 13, 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Akram in view of Reymond, Jones, Farnworth, Pommer and Smith.

For claims 9, 10, 19, Akram lacks use of temperature control means. Pommer uses such feature at 51, 52. Obvious to use such means in Akram assembly to protect the semiconductor. For claim 13, Smith shows use of a vacuum chuck. Obvious to use such feature in Akram for ease in placing component 12 onto the socket part 36.

Applicant's arguments filed with the amendment have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Basically rejection of claim 2 only requires use of Akram socket with another well known type of component. No other changes are seen to be required. As to arguments that Reymond connection elements are not readable as elongate other references are now applied to more clearly show such elongate spring contacts.

Argument that Reymond does not relate to testing "unpackaged" integrated" integrated circuits is not persuasive since claims 1, 17, etc do not require unpackaged" devices. For any claim that requires such type component Farnworth is now applied.

For claim 17, to overcome rejection using Akram alone line 1 could be amended to include preamble that refers to use of the apparatus to receive semiconductor devices with elongate spring connection elements."

Claims 3-6 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Any inquiry concerning this communication should be directed to Neil Abrams at telephone number (571)272-2089.

Abrams/ds

05/03/05


NEIL ABRAMS
EXAMINER
ART UNIT 322